

## **Bangs Canyon EA**

### **Analysis of significant comments from the Public as received during the public comment period that ended Oct. 23, 2005**

#### **1: Wants quiet recreation.**

BLM has the obligation to provide a wide range of recreational opportunities to the public. When the decision is fully implemented, 34,044 acres of the Bangs Canyon area will be managed for back county values. Those seeking a non-motorized recreation experience can also be served by the 20,000-acre Colorado National Monument, our neighbor to the west. The Black Canyon Wilderness just west of the monument provides another 76,000 acres of solitude and opportunity for unconfined recreation. This office also manages 166,000 acres of Wilderness Study Areas that are managed for non-motorized activities.

#### **2: Wants data on vehicle impacts and Mancos: comparative with Utah.**

The Mancos shale issues in Utah are not comparable to those found in the desert north of Grand Junction. The soils are different and the proximity to major waterways is different.

#### **3: Snyder Flats Rd. not a public road.**

Snyder Flats Rd. is BLM road #7336. It is open to public access at the discretion of the field office Manager.

#### **4: Public access to remote areas of public lands does not create conflicts-Moab is example.**

Many popular recreation locations in the Rural West encourage multiple use of trails and other facilities. When the public is adequately informed that a wide variety of activities are welcome, conflicts are rare. The EA and good management practices direct BLM to inform the public about the experience they can expect in any location in Bangs Canyon.

*Source: Conflicts on Multiple-Use Trails: Roger Moore, U.S. Dept. of Transportation-Federal Highway Administration*

#### **5: Commenter claims that negative impacts of motorized recreation are detrimental to and displaces wildlife.**

A detailed discussion of the impacts to wildlife in the four alternatives is found on page 41 of the document. The analysis was prepared by a BLM staff biologist. It concludes that the impacts are mixed. The additional access will reduce the elk herd to its target size and will increase the availability of forage for the under population of deer. Non game species will see no effect. Research consistently indicates that wildlife is unaffected by trail-based OHV recreation.

*Source: Research on the effects of OHV Recreation on Wildlife: Jeff Devol, et al 1999*

A study of Colorado Elk concludes that elk will rapidly adapt to changes in the level of human contact. The predictability of human contact is a factor in the rate of adaptability. Further research indicates that the predictable location and frequency of motorized recreation on a trail system has less disturbance to elk than cross-country hiking off of trails.

*Source: Responses of National Park Elk to Human Activity: Shultz- Colorado State University*

#### 6: EA does not conform to 1999 Plan.

The implementation EA does conform to the plan. The plan is vague in several areas. Where the plan gives specific direction, these directions are followed. Where the plan is vague or makes no specific recommendations, the EA refers to the Resource Management Plan (RMP) for guidance. For example, the management direction for Area 6 in the plan is two-sentences long and gives no guidance about travel or recreation issues. We have deferred to the RMP for direction. The RMP shows a Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) calling for semi-primitive, motorized recreation on mesas and semi-primitive, non-motorized recreation in the canyons. BLM's alternatives follow these prescriptions. Similarly, the plan specifically encourages the development of motorized trails in Area 4, hiking and bicycle opportunities in Area 1, and the completion of the Magellan Loop in Areas 4 and 5. BLM has incorporated all of these recommendations into the alternatives in the implementation EA.

#### 7: EA does not address traffic on Little Park Road.

This EA is an analysis of a proposed federal action. BLM has no authority off the federal lands that it is charged with managing. Little Park Road is a Mesa County road. BLM has no authority to plan for, or manage access or use of a county road.

Mesa County Sheriff's records show a total of 18 traffic complaints on Little Park Road from 1999 to November 29, 2005. Only four of these complaints were found to be legitimate by the responding officer. During the same six-year time period, there were two injury accidents and one non-injury accident reported to the sheriff on Little Park Road.

#### 8: Noise impacts on quality of life on Little Park Road are not analyzed.

The issue of noise is addressed in Appendix A of the EA, *Criteria for the Placement of Trails*, items 9 and 10. The issue of noise is also addressed by the 96-db sound limit on all OHVs. The placement of trails in Areas 4 and 6 has been carefully considered specifically to minimize noise in populated areas. Motorized trails are located so that ridges and drainages act as sound buffers.

Further, the issue of sound versus noise is a values-based decision of the individual observer. Sound is quantifiable, but noise is a value judgment.

Sound naturally travels up during the heat of the day, so the night closures of areas near occupied residences enhances the protection from noise.

*Source: Predicting the Impact of Noise on Recreationists by: Robin T. Anderson, et al, EPA, 1980*

The level of annoyance to the observer is independent of the intensity of the sound. The sounds of motorized recreation are among the most annoying of any sound to the non-participating casual observer. Therefore, there is no acceptable standard outside of silence for those who do not value the activity that creates the sound.

*Source: Factors affecting response to Noise in an outdoor recreation environment. HG Kargiel, Dept. of Geography University of Calgary*

The Mesa County Sheriff reports that they received seven loud-party complaints from Little Park Road residents. The last complaint is dated 10/06/01. This coincides with the completion of the BLM fence along the east side of Little Park Road. The lack of complaints after 2001 is a clear indication of the effectiveness of BLM management actions in the urban interface recreation zone.

9: Commenter doubts the ability of BLM to enforce proposed regulations because of budget issues.

Law enforcement is one leg of a triangle that is required for a successful recreation project. The other two legs are engineering and education. The need for law enforcement on a large scale is indicative of a deficiency in one of the other sides of the triangle. This office presently hosts over one million recreation visitors a year. Law enforcement is not a major issue at this time, and a better engineered trail-based opportunity as described in the decision will encourage compliance from visitors. The signing and on-the-ground presence of uniformed BLM personnel to aid and inform the public is a major portion of the education aspect of this development.

10: EA is unclear on the land acquisition issues.

BLM is actively trying to acquire the parcels as indicated on the map. In some cases, legal actions will slow or possibly halt those efforts. BLM only acquires land from willing sellers, or through exchanges, based on appraised values. These actions and negotiations are lengthy and often complex.

11: Commenter is concerned about sediment from Area 4 trails in Redlands Canal.

The Redlands Canal is not a federal facility; it is owned by the Redlands Water and Power Company and is not part of the planning area.

12: Commenter wants a traffic study of Monument and Little Park Roads, including forecasted traffic over 5 to 10 year period.

See #7 above.

13: Wants to see east end of Tabeguache Trail stay open to motorized access.

The east end of the Tab has not been open to motorized access to Highway 141 for many years. The only access is by permission from the private land owner. The land owners are not interested in an easement or other legal access. Consequently, the alternatives all show a reroute of the trail through North East Creek and Snyder Flats Road.

14: Trails should be located so as not to cause trespass (Landowner about road near his gate).

The staff has gone to great lengths to select routes that will be sustainable and will cause the least interruption in the lifestyle to adjoining land owners. In all cases, routes going to private lands are proposed for closure, or to be classified as administrative routes, closed to the public.

15: Commenter requests a balanced plan.

The land use decisions proposed for implementation in this document were made in the 1999 Bangs Canyon Management Plan. The balance of the plan was decided at that time. This EA is not a land use allocation decision document. Our present goal is to put the decisions made in the 1999 plan on-the-ground.

16: None of the alternatives presented in the EA provide enough recreation opportunities to meet current and predictable future needs of the community. It is not the goal of this project to satisfy the regional demand for recreation opportunity. Western Colorado has many locations that supply the recreational demand in different ways and in different seasons of the year. We hope through our efforts and the efforts of other agencies to be able to keep up with the demand in a variety of locations.

17: Need for well developed trailheads with sanitation facilities.

Three new trailhead facilities are included in the preferred alternative. All may have sanitation facilities.

18: Request for a trail connecting Hells Hole to Windmill Road.

The BCMP is silent on the issue of trail development in Area 5. Hells Hole is in Area5. Bangs Canyon Plan, page 11

*In recognition of the remote nature of the area, emphasize goal of minimizing environmental impact, i.e. (in the consideration of new trails and or recreation opportunities).*

In response to comments from the community, an ATV trail is planned to link Hells Hole and the route along the Gunnison River. An ATV loop will then be completed by connecting the Horse Mesa trails with the Area 4 routes.

19: Commenter observed big improvements in the condition of public lands and behavior since the start of implementation of the 1999 plan. Less partying, no more garbage dumps. Less anti-social behavior.

20: Commenter objects to restrictions on dispersed camping-over regulation compared to level of impact.

BLM expects the number of visitors to continue to increase in Bangs Canyon. The long-distance route created by completing the connection of the Tabeguache Trail to Highway 141 will provide a multi-day 4X4 opportunity, and dispersed camping by hunters is a common practice now. The restrictions in the alternatives are similar to those BLM requires in other desert environments.

21. Paintball restrictions are over regulation.

Paint ball restrictions were included in the proposal regulations because large buildups of paint are defacing signs, fences and natural features in popular paint ball locations. Paint ball materials are biodegradable in water. The project area is a desert with less than 10 inches of annual rainfall. Paint ball residue lasts a long time in this area.

22: Requests seasonal restrictions on all activities after public input.

Provisions for seasonal closures are included in the decision. Closure would be an administrative decision. No public participation is required.

The higher elevations of the Bangs Canyon Planning Area will close themselves for several months a year as a result of snow-pack levels.

23: Concerns that additional OHV use would increase potential for wildland fire.

The increase in human presence will not have a significant impact on potential for fire. Bangs Canyon in general is not at high risk for fire. The pinyon stands are widely spaced and do not form a canopy sufficiently dense enough to support the spread of fire. Ground fuels are also sparse. The geomorphology of deep, rock-bottom canyons would limit the spread of fire if it were to happen. All OHVs are required by law to have USDA-approved spark arrestors fitted to their exhaust systems. Most OHVs come from the factory equipped with spark arrestors. A greater potential fire source is the use of street legal vehicles equipped with catalytic converters. The converters operate at very high temperatures and have been known to start grass fires.

24: Concern that weeds would be carried by motorized users.

Non-native vegetation is a threat throughout the west. Seeds and spores can be carried by many sources including the wind, animals, humans and vehicles. One cannot single out vehicles as the main culprit. A thorough discussion of the weed issue is included in the EA.

25: Habitat fragmentation from trails.

Development for recreational trails may have an effect on habitat. In general the wider the route is, the greater the potential for fragmentation. The higher the density of routes, the greater the potential for fragmentation. The bulk of the proposed new routes will be

single track, less than 24 inches wide. All of the new development is located at the far north and far south ends of the planning area. All routes west of the Tabeguache will be closed to public access. This leaves the central core of 34,000 acres without any human routes. The result is to concentrate the influences of humans to the extremities, leaving the core area as undeveloped as possible.

**26: Motorized and non-motorized trails are not differentiated in our analysis.**

The EA and the proposed routes, both proposed for construction and proposed closed, are evaluated for conformance to the *Criteria for the Placement of Trails* (see Appendix A). The result of this EA is a Finding of No Significant Impact. If routes meet the criteria, the mode of travel is not a significant contributing factor in determining the level of impact.

If the route plan truly has no significant impact, the mode of allowed travel does not enter into the determination of impact. Hence, differentiation serves no end.

**27: Inadequate range of alternatives.**

All four alternatives were crafted to accomplish the objectives as identified in the PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED ACTION: on page 3 of the EA. The No Action Alternative is required by NEPA. The three Action Alternatives each propose a different method of achieving the goals as identified in the EA and the Bangs Canyon Plan. Each alternative conforms to the plan and fully implements the intent as described in the plan. The differences between alternatives reflect changes in emphasis.

**28: New routes would improve access for fire suppression.**

The proposed Tabeguache connection and the joining of Snyder Flats Road to North East Creek Road would greatly benefit the movement of ground base fire suppression crews.

**29: Unplanned trail proliferation in desert is indicative of the future of Bangs if additional OHV routes are allowed.**

It is true that many unplanned trails have sprung up in the Mancos deserts surrounding Grand Junction. It is very difficult to manage a recreational trail system in a landscape where few obstacles exist to cross-country travel. This is exactly why planned trails in a suitable environment are so important to the community. The public demand for OHV opportunities continues to grow, and managed and planned sustainable-trail systems are essential to the control of impacts and good management. By providing a quality trail system in a scenic location, we will attract a significant number of visitors to Bangs Canyon and away from the Mancos desert where route management is very difficult. The trails proposed in Bangs Canyon are sustainable and situated so as to prevent off-trail travel and new unplanned routes. The proposed trails are in rugged terrain with side slopes, good drainage and vegetative cover or rock formations to limit trespass and off-trail excursions.

30: Claim of new user-created illegal trails in Bangs since the opening of Billings Canyon Jeep Trail.

Billings Canyon Jeep Trail was photo monitored monthly from its opening to the public in May 2004 until May 2005. It has been photo monitored quarterly since May 2005. Our staff visits Bangs Canyon several times a week on routine business. The planning staff has spent many weeks on field research and route analysis over the past year. No new trails have been observed by our staff since March 2003.

31: Commenter accuses BLM of sacrificing lands to a minority of OHV visitors.

BLM does not "sacrifice lands" for any reason. BLM is charged with managing public lands for a wide variety of commercial, recreation and aesthetic values. OHV use is a manageable activity on public lands, just like the many other activities we manage for. Successful management requires good planning and design of recreational routes on a sustainable landscape. This is the reason that some areas are better suited to OHV recreation than others. Our traffic counters indicate that over 200,000 people visit the North Desert for motorized recreation each year.

32: Encourages construction of single-track trails built to a high standard to control offsite impacts.

Single-track trails are a high-value commodity in the recreation world. It is our intention to build the best quality trails both for the enjoyment of the public and the containment of impacts. The better the trail meets the demands of the visitor the less likely the visitor is to meander off the trail. Appendix A is the *Criteria for the Placement of Trails*. All trails constructed in the project will meet or exceed these criteria. In addition our goal over time is to bring all of the routes we adopt from existing inventory up to the standards of our newly constructed routes.

33: Encourages construction of ATV trails to provide access for elderly and disabled.

The proposed recreation travel system will provide a significant improvement in ATV access for trail riding and general access to the backcountry. We propose to construct a mix of trails to accommodate as many different recreation opportunities as the landscape will allow. Not all routes will be constructed to accommodate all visitors. Unfortunately that would preclude all single track and ATV wide routes.

34: Writer opposes the segregation of visitors by activity.

The commenter's point is well taken. The inevitable issue of conflict comes up at urban interface and other high-use recreation sites. Multiple use without zoning works best where the density of visitors is least. In other words, in remote primitive areas with few visitors, multiple use has fewer restrictions. In the urban interface areas we are managing, integration of activities is politically unfeasible. Some attempts to integrate visitors are accomplished by limiting the number of trailheads and forcing the various visitor groups to park alongside each other.

35: Tabeguache open to Hwy. 141 and more jeep trails in Area 4 - not consistent with 1999 plan.

Bangs Canyon Plan, page 10 paragraph 8: *New single track and two track trail construction is encouraged, and will be allowed in the future subject to BLM evaluation.*

36: Limit density of single-track trails in Area 4.

The trail density in Area 4, as shown in the preferred alternative, is higher than optimum in a well planned recreational trail system. The density is the result providing a suitable size trail system to entertain a typical visitor for 3 to 4 hours. This requires a trail network of 20 to 25 miles. Area 4 is 4,476 acres. As a result, the decision shows some of the trails have been moved into the north portion of Area 5. The trails were designed to avoid the north portion of Area 4 to accommodate potential noise issues with neighboring residences.

37: Expressed concerns with ATV safety issues, particularly to youth.

It is true that recreation in a wildland environment can be dangerous. The Bangs Canyon area is often a hostile environment for humans. ATVs are the recreation of choice for a large percentage of the public, including children. Due to the rapid growth of this sport, accident statistics are hard to understand. The Consumer Products Safety Commission has established guidelines for the sale and use of ATVs, and the industry has complied and backed an extensive training and awareness program. Most ATV accidents involving children happen on private lands where the children are not supervised by an adult, or the operator is not observing the recommendations of the manufacturer.

38: New OHV opportunity in Bangs will help replace lost opportunities elsewhere in the community.

During the early stages of the implementation of the plan, many of the actions were aimed at restricting motorized access to traditional opportunities. The full implementation would more than replace those lost trails with better trails and more access to the backcountry.

39: Construction of motorized trails is a significant impact to the human environment and therefore requires an EIS.

The land use allocations permitting and restricting the construction of motorized trails were made in the RMP of 1987. The RMP included an EIS. In 1999 the Bangs Canyon Plan further refined those allocations for portions of the planning area. Where the 1999 plan is silent, the RMP is the guiding decision document. The EA is consistent with the both of these decision documents. The EA did not identify any information considered to be significant in context or intensity that had not been previously analyzed in the 1987 EIS. Therefore an EIS is not necessary.

40: Additional single-track trails add the quality of life of local MTB and motorcycle enthusiasts.



Our unscientific observations indicate that many locals and visitors enjoy both motorcycle and bicycle riding. Single track is the highly valued experience that many seek. In addition, single track is less expensive and easier to construct than ATV or 4X4 routes.

41: Lack of opportunities for Observed trials, both motorized and bicycle. Observed trials is a unique sport that requires open access to small tracts of land. All of the Bangs Canyon Planning Area is managed as designated routes. We hope to locate a suitable location to accommodate trials in the field office. We have made connections with the trials community and are trying to coordinate demonstration events.

## **BANGS CANYON IMPLEMENTATION EA COMMENT SUMMARY**

### **1. Support Alternative One**

**61 letters**

- Manage motorized recreation, don't eliminate it.
- Willing to help create, maintain and patrol trails.
- Support OHV and mountain bike backcountry designation.
- Wilderness inventory done w/out public involvement.
- Bangs important urban interface area.
- Support HWY 141 connection from Little Park.
- Corduroy Springs should be open to motorized use.
- Support noise restriction.
- Support segregating uses to reduce user conflict.
- Willing to share trails with ATVs, horses, hikers & mountain bikes.
- Support motorcycle trials in Bangs.
- Need more ATV trails.
- ATV trails needed for elderly and disabled.
- Need to anticipate future growing uses of public lands.
- BLM is living up to its promise to motorized users.

### **2. Support Alternative Two**

**16 letters**

- Failure to plan and implement contributes to "problem" of motorized use.
- Provides for diversity of uses.
- Need Freeride/Downhill MTB trails.
- Need less technical trails in the Lunch Loop.
- Access to trails directly off of HWY 141 will likely reduce traffic on Little Park Road.
- Willing to get company to adopt a trail.
- Support Alt 2 for Areas 1, 2, 3.
- Expand Area 3 for hiking.
- Tabeguache in existence since 1895, original route from GJ to Montrose.

### **3. Support Alternative Three**

**2 letters**

- Support Alt 3 for Areas 4, 5, 6.
- Motorized use will displace bikers, hikers, and horse riders.
- Support alt 3 w/modifications.

**4. Support Alternative Four**

**14 letters**

- Close no 4wd roads.
- Roads used for fire, rescue emergencies, handicap access and by Mesa Co residents (rise of gas prices necessitates local areas to enjoy.)
- Failure to follow ad hoc committee recommendations makes mockery of committee.
- BLM doesn't have adequate funds to maintain/improve routes.
- Take care of existing routes before constructing new.
- Attempts to cluster trail building in N, W and S important.
- Do not make HWY 141 connection.
- Balanced is tipped toward motorized.
- Rosevale and Little Park not designed to handle influx of traffic. Traffic concerns on D road. Safety issues with blind driveways. County has not done traffic study. 40 Little Park landowners concerned.
- Follow recommendation not to connect to Hwy 141.
- Do not close Mica Mine to horseback use.
- Concerned about noise in neighborhood (Little Park).
- BLM cannot manage its lands currently. How can it manage new trails?
- Little Park landowners have financial investment in properties and feel they will decline with BCMA.
- Headlights and motor vehicles will destroy views from Little Park.
- Current users on Tabeguache bring in trash, broken glass and fire rings.
- Select the no action until the County does a traffic study and provides for safety.

**5. Little Park residents – pro**

**2 letters**

- Supports plan. Allows access for elderly citizen who otherwise wouldn't be able to enjoy area. Impacts quality of life.
- Traffic will increase regardless of Bangs proposals.
- Partially disabled and unable to hike. Needs mechanical transportation.
- Understand need for alternate area off of the North Desert for motorized.

**6. Little Park residents – negative**

**33 letters**

- Concerned about traffic impacts on Little Park. Traffic bad now.
- Have had to rescue people from Bangs Canyon in the past.
- Many wild parties with bonfires.
- Concerned additional activity on road could close road...this is only access to town.
- Keep Bangs the way it is.
- Worry about pedestrian traffic on Little Park Road combined with additional motor traffic.
- Concerned about children and pets safety.
- Enjoy quiet peaceful area and adjacent hike/bike trails.
- Plan will increase traffic 4-5 fold, increase noise and potential for accidents.
- Need EIS.
- Marginally rural area.

- Motorized incompatible with horse use. Require them to trailer further.
- Most residents enjoy quiet provided by surrounding BLM.
- BLM should be a good neighbor and respect residents.
- Motorized traffic noisier than hike/bike/horse and may be inexperienced, unlicensed, underage riders unconcerned w/trail ethics. Move conflicts further.
- Concede the need for more motorized trails in growing valley.
- Selfishness of love of privacy.
- Safety on road.
- Has safety of bikers on road been considered?
- Called BLM office to complain of ATVs tearing up trails and off-roading.
- ATVs/jeeps often driven by drunk drivers at night.
- Has BLM estimated use? Monitoring trails/damage?
- Hear every car going up Little Park Road.
- Gunshots echo from range near DOE.
- Impacts on property values from motorized trails.
- Motorized users don't appreciate scenery.
- Rosevale Road was a trail in 1927.
- Four cars plowed through yard.
- Impossible to widen D road.
- Existing road system inadequate.
- Concerned about effects on views.
- Does not believe plan is necessary.
- Traffic counts from Mesa Co. roads in 5/2004 show 1040 passes/day.
- Concerned about traffic at Monument and D roads
- Substandard bridge over No Thoroughfare Canyon
- Accident on curve past bridge every 3-4 months.
- D and Rosevale roads are too narrow to accommodate additional traffic.
- Little Park hidden drives, intersection, steep grades and bicycle traffic
- Intersection at Arroyo and Little Park hidden intersection to downhill traffic
- Driveway 500 feet beyond curve and hidden to uphill traffic. Safety issue for those pulling trailer.
- Concerned motorcycles will fly up Little Park creating dangerous situations along entire route.
- Bad maps with EA.
- Emission pollution will increase.

**7. Comments Letter w/no content**

**10 letters**

**8. Blue Ribbon Coalition Form Letters (ALT ONE 22)**

**28 letters**

- Opposed to wilderness designation.
- Support Backcountry Recreation designation for OHV and MTB.
- Support Little Park to Hwy 141 Connector, needed for recreation and hunting access.
- Corduroy Sp open to motorized.
- Wilderness evaluation done w/out public input and opportunity for the public to provide supplementary info.

- Huge public demand for managed trail systems.
- Older ATV riders need to be provided for.

**9. MTRA Form Letters (ALT ONE 24, ALT TWO 2) 29 letters**

- Roads/trails closed in past limiting public's enjoyment of their public lands. Alt 1 is needed to replace lost opportunity.
- Would visit Bangs more frequently if more roads/trails open.
- Motorized recreation limited so people must use same trails which limits enjoyment of these areas. Add to inventory of trails and accommodate growing need for room to ride.
- Prefer trails to roads. Roads are for cars. (ATV and motorcycle)
- Time for BLM to replace closed user-built trails with properly built trails. I will help if asked.
- I ride motorcycles, ATVs and drive 4wd on public lands.
- Adding trails close to town will make community better place to live and help economy.
- Plan lacks ATV trails. Add more ATV trails to Alt 1.
- More elderly and disabled exploring backcountry.
- Rough 4wd roads more dangerous to the ATV rider than a 50-inch wide trail due to full size vehicle track and spinning of wheels leaving holes in front of rocks.
- WSATVA original partner in Bangs and active in maintenance, trash pick up, dismantling fire rings and blocking user created routes (1990). No other group has done more but ATV group seeing least amount of trails.
- Roads not good enough for hikers, bikers or motorcyclists, why should ATVers accept them?
- Adding trails will gain GJ more \$\$ through tourism.
- OHV use family oriented.
- Cannot hike, need ATV to get around.

**10. More ATV trails (all comments found under 9, MTRA, above PLUS:) 20 letters**

- Motorized/ATV access should remain at Hwy 141 at Unaweep.
- All 4wd roads should remain open to ATV.
- Areas 6, Alt 1 motorcycle trails open for ATV.
- Area 5, proposed foot and equestrian open to ATV.
- Managers of public lands should promote/facilitate ADA.
- ATVers not getting their share, could ride proposed trails in 1 hour.
- Against closing any trails.
- Connect existing dead-end route south of Hells Hole with new ATV route north of Windmill.
- Connect ATV route off of dead end at Corduroy Sp in Area 6 to vicinity of Northeast Creek trail.
- Add more ATV trails to Area 4.

**11. Support Freeride Trails**

**4 letters**

- Need freeride/downhill trail in Bangs.
- User conflicts starting to develop between runners and bikers on existing trail system.
- Need challenging and alternate routes.
- Many Freeriders in valley that would help build trails.
- Freeride trails would alleviate illegal route building. This is fastest growing group.
- Freeriders need challenge. Trail should be double-black diamond, directional and hard. Technical trail that is rough, high speed sections, and some jumps and drops.

**12. Motorcycle Trials**

**4 letters**

- Rocky Mountain Trials Association family oriented and responsible, in tune with the environment.
- Designate trials areas in Bangs.
- European Dirt promotes and sells motorcycle sport of observed trials. Sport of balance, traction and control. Machines lightweight and quiet.
- Should be allowed as part of planning for recreational trails.
- No trials locations on the Western Slope.
- Bangs Canyon could have National Trials events.
- Supports Alt 1.
- Would like to work with BLM to establish trials location in Bangs.

**13. Pro-wilderness - 162 letters**

**14. Anti-wilderness -21 letters**

**15. Love motorized - 16 letters**

**16. Hate motorized - 70 letters**

**17. Need new Alternative -4 letters**

- Include WSA designation Alt.
- Consider more motorized trails in Area 1, 2, 4.
- Re-open Rough Canyon Trail to motorized.

**18. Form emails from The Wilderness Society – 2,371 emails**

- Supporting balanced decision.